

Fiscal Note 2011 Biennium

Bill #	HB0166			le:	Increase DOJ prosecutor for fish and game law violations to full-time attorney		
Primary Sponsor:	nsor: Menahan, Mike Status: As Introduced-Revised						
☐ Significant	Local Gov Impact	V	Needs to be included in HI	IB 2		Technical Concerns	
☑ Included in	the Executive Budget		Significant Long-Term Imp	pacts		Dedicated Revenue Form Attached	

FISCAL SUMMARY

	FY 2010 <u>Difference</u>	FY 2011 <u>Difference</u>	FY 2012 <u>Difference</u>	FY 2013 <u>Difference</u>
Expenditures:				
General Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State Special Revenue	\$117,078	\$111,878	\$114,676	\$117,542
Revenue:				
General Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State Special Revenue	\$58,539	\$55,939	\$57,338	\$58,771
Net Impact-General Fund Balance	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

Description of fiscal impact:

This bill would allow the Department of Justice (DoJ) to provide 0.50 additional FTE to assist in Department of Fish Wildlife and Parks (FWP) prosecutions. This bill will increase expenditures from the state special revenue fund of the FWP.

FISCAL ANALYSIS

Assumptions:

Department of Justice

- 1. FWP currently provides \$58,098 for FY 2009 through a Memorandum of Understanding to fund the current 0.50 FTE lawyer dedicated to FWP prosecutions. It is assumed that this agreement will continue, with FWP continuing to fund the original 0.50 FTE.
- 2. The personal services costs for the additional 0.50 FTE lawyer in FY 2010 is \$48,439.
- 3. The new employee office package will cost \$1,200 and new computer equipment will cost \$1,400 in FY 2010 only.

- 4. General operating expenses based on FY 2008 actual expenditures are estimated to be \$7,500 in FY 2010 and ongoing.
- 5. A 2.5% annual inflation factor is applied for the 2013 biennium.

Department of Fish, Wildlife and Parks (FWP)

- 6. The FWP will modify the existing MoU to include the additional 0.50 FTE included in this bill.
- 7. The FWP will pay, according to the MoU, all expenses incurred by the DoJ (as stated above) for prosecution services.

Office of the State Public Defender

8. The OPD assumes that there will be no increase in cases prosecuted, but just a shift from prosecution at the local level to the state level.

	FY 2010 Difference	FY 2011 Difference	FY 2012 <u>Difference</u>	FY 2013 <u>Difference</u>
Fiscal Impact:				
Department of Justice				
FTE	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50
Expenditures:				
Personal Services	\$48,439	\$48,439	\$49,650	\$50,891
Operating Expenses	\$10,100	\$7,500	\$7,688	\$7,880
TOTAL Expenditures	\$58,539	\$55,939	\$57,338	\$58,771
Funding of Expenditures:				
State Special Revenue (02)	\$58,539	\$55,939	\$57,338	\$58,771
Revenues:				
State Special Revenue (02)	\$58,539	\$55,939	\$57,338	\$58,771
Department of Fish Wildlife of	and Parks			
Expenditures:				
Operating Expenses	\$58,539	\$55,939	\$57,338	\$58,771
Funding of Expenditures:				
State Special Revenue (02)	\$58,539	\$55,939	\$57,338	\$58,771
Net Impact to Fund Balance				
General Fund (01)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State Special Revenue (02)	(\$58,539)	(\$55,939)	(\$57,338)	(\$58,771)
		_		
0 1 1 1 1	D .	$\mathbf{D} = \mathbf{I} + \mathbf{D}^*$, , , ,	D 4

Budget Director's Initials

Date

Sponsor's Initials

Date